



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/602,573	06/24/2003	Brian R. Tunning	MSI-1484US	1776
22801	7590	11/21/2005	EXAMINER	
LEE & HAYES PLLC 421 W RIVERSIDE AVENUE SUITE 500 SPOKANE, WA 99201			PATEL, MANGLESH M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2178	

DATE MAILED: 11/21/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/602,573	TUNNING, BRIAN R.	
	Examiner Manglesh M. Patel	Art Unit 2178	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 June 2003.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-67 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-67 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 24 June 2003 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: Application filed on June 24, 2003.

2. Claims 1-67 are pending. Claims 1, 10, 32, 47, 49, 58 and 61 are independent claims.

Drawings

3. The examiner has accepted the Drawings filed on June 24, 2003.

Specification

4. The specification is objected to because it fails to identify the application number of the listed co-pending application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

5. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
6. Claims 16 & 47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claim 47 states "wherein a web browser **can** find the pane-generating logic" and "**optionally**, a list of attribute variables" the description is

Art Unit: 2178

unclear since the words **can** and **optionally** render the claims indefinite. Claim 16 contains the word **can** rendering the claim indefinite.

7. Claim 48 is rejected because it inherits the deficiencies of independent claim 47.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

8. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

9. Claims 1-31 & 61-67 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. The language of the claims raise a question as to whether the claims are directed merely to an abstract idea that is not tied to a technological art, environment or machine which would result in a practical application producing a concrete, useful, and tangible result to form the basis of statutory subject matter under 35 U.S.C. 101.

10. Claims 32-57 are rejected because the claims are directed to non-functional descriptive material directed to a web document, pane element and pane engine.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

11. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

Art Unit: 2178

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

12. Claims 1-20, 27, 32-38, 43, 47-48, 58-59 & 60-67 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Klevenz (U.S. Pub 2003/0137540, filed Dec 26, 2002).

Regarding Independent claim 1, Klevenz discloses a *method, comprising:*

- *Providing a pane element* (See figure 4A, paragraph 80, wherein section 410 defines the pane with an identifier and layout components. Therefore it defines a pane element that is used to generate a pane. In addition the pane pertains to an element because it contains a pane start tag <WDF:Panes> and an end tag </WDF:Panes>);
- *Based at least in part on execution of the pane element, invoking logic associated with the pane element wherein the logic specifies at least some attributes of a pane* (See figure 4A, paragraph 80, wherein the logic associated with the pane is defined by an identifier of the pane and attributes associated by layout of the pane);
- *And generating the pane having the specified attributes* (See figure 4A, paragraphs 7 & 80, wherein the attributes are identified by the layout information for generating panes).

Regarding Dependent claims 2 & 62, Klevenz discloses *wherein the pane element directs a reference to and execution of the associated logic* (See figure 4A & paragraph 80, wherein the pane element described by the pane tag is

directed to the execution of the pane definition that is contained within the body of the pane element shown in reference numerals 410A-D).

Regarding Dependent claim 3, Klevenz discloses *wherein the pane element comprises a tag* (See figure 4A & paragraph 80, wherein the pane element comprises a tag <WDF: Panes>).

Regarding Dependent claim 4, Klevenz discloses *wherein the pane element comprises an HTML tag* (See paragraphs 47, 49, 79 & 80, wherein the configuration file shown in this case is described in XML, but it could be in any appropriate programming language including HTML).

Regarding Dependent claim 5, Klevenz discloses *wherein executing the tag causes the invoking of the logic* (paragraph 80, wherein the execution of the specification page for pane generation causes the invoking of the logic within the pane tags).

Regarding Dependent claim 6, Klevenz discloses *wherein the providing provides a document that includes a pane element* (paragraph 80, wherein the specification page is the provided document that includes a pane element).

Regarding Dependent claims 7 & 65, Klevenz discloses *wherein the providing provides a document that includes markup language* (paragraph 80, wherein the specification page provides a document in a markup language).

Regarding Dependent claims 8 & 66, Klevenz discloses *wherein the logic includes pane-generating instructions* (paragraph 80, wherein the logic associated to the pane definition within the pane element describes pane-generating instructions).

Regarding Dependent claims 9 & 67, Klevenz discloses *wherein the generating generates a viewable pane as an area of a web page* (See figure 4A, paragraphs 44, 47 & 80, wherein a pane is generated upon the execution of the specification page defining a viewable pane for a web page).

Regarding Independent claim 10, Klevenz discloses *a method, comprising:*

- *Providing a pane element in a web page document for producing a web page* (See figure 4A, paragraphs 79, 80 & 109, wherein section 410 defines the pane with an identifier and layout components. In addition the pane element is defined within a web page document Therefore it defines a pane element which is used to generate a pane in the web page);
- *And executing the pane element wherein the executing invokes logic associated with the pane element, wherein the logic specifies at least*

some attributes of a pane, and wherein the executing generates a pane having the specified attributes (See figure 4A, paragraphs 7 & 80, wherein the pane definitions are executed invokes logic defined by an identifier that describes layout information pertaining to attributes of a pane, therefore the execution will generate a pane with the associated layout information).

Regarding Dependent claim 11, Klevenz discloses *wherein the web page document comprises HTML (See paragraphs 47, 49, 79 & 80, wherein the web page document includes HTML).*

Regarding Dependent claims 12 & 60, Klevenz discloses *wherein the logic associated with the pane element comprises at least one element behavior associated with the pane element (See figure 4A & paragraph 80, wherein the logic pertaining to the pane definition within the pane element defined by the pane tags describe layout of components within the pane, therefore the layout components describe at least one element behavior of the pane element).*

Regarding Dependent claim 13, Klevenz discloses *wherein the pane-element includes pane attributes to determine one of a size, a dimension, a shape, a color, a format, a priority, and a style of the pane (paragraph 80, wherein the pane attributes described by layout information inherently include size,*

dimension, shape, color, priority and style of a pane).

Regarding Dependent claim 14, Klevenz discloses *wherein the pane element includes associated content capable of being displayed in the pane* (paragraph 59, wherein the pane includes the display of various data including web content).

Regarding Dependent claim 15, Klevenz discloses *wherein the display content is one of a text, an image, a link, and a user interface* (paragraph 59, wherein the various data includes a user interface).

Regarding Dependent claim 16, Klevenz discloses *wherein the user interface has interactive controls, wherein a user can provide input in response to the content* (paragraphs 59, 65, 69, 84 & 91, wherein the pane generation includes controls for the pane. Also the user interface has input and output from an application, along with its functions that are displayed within a user interface).

Regarding Dependent claim 17, Klevenz discloses *wherein the pane element includes content attributes to determine one of a size, a dimension, a shape, a color, a format, a priority, a style, and a font of the content to be displayed in the pane* (paragraphs 59 & 80, wherein the identifier within the markup document defines the layout or attributes of components in the pane).

Regarding Dependent claim 18, Klevenz discloses *wherein the pane-generating instructions determine the pane attributes based on the amount of content* (paragraph 56, wherein the logic determines a result based on the information for pane generation).

Regarding Dependent claim 19, Klevenz discloses *wherein the associated logic determines the pane attributes based on the content attributes* (paragraphs 56 & 80, wherein the logic determines a result based on the information for pane generation; therefore it includes the determination of layout information based on content attributes).

Regarding Dependent claim 20, Klevenz discloses *multiple pane elements in the web page document to generate multiple panes in the web page* (See figure 4A & paragraph 80, wherein multiple panes are generated within the web page).

Regarding Dependent claims 27 & 43, Klevenz discloses *wherein the associated logic assigns a placement to each pane in the web page* (paragraph 56, wherein the controller instructs the application framework as to the composition of the new pane with associated arrangements thereby providing placement of a pane in the web page).

Regarding Independent claim 32, Klevenz discloses a web page document, comprising:

- *Content to be displayed in a web page resulting from rendering the web page document* (paragraph 109, wherein the content is inherently displayed within the rendered web page document);
- *Markup tags to indicate instructions for displaying the content in the web page* (paragraph 47, It is well known in the art that a web document must be associated with markup information to generate content within a web page);
- *And a pane element to provide instructions for using a division of a computer display screen, wherein execution of the pane tag causes pane-generating instructions to be substituted for the pane tag* (See figure 4A, paragraphs 79, 80 & 109, wherein section 410 defines the pane with an identifier and layout components. In addition the pane element is defined within a web page document, therefore the associated pane tag causes instructions to be submitted within the pane tag to generate a web page document).

Regarding Dependent claim 33 & 59, Klevenz discloses wherein the web page document is an HTML document (See paragraphs 47, 49, 79 & 80, wherein the web page document includes HTML).

Regarding Dependent claim 34, Klevenz discloses *wherein the pane-generating instructions are at least one element behavior bound to the pane element* (See figure 4A & paragraph 80, wherein the logic pertaining to the pane definition within the pane element defined by the pane tags describe layout of components within the pane, therefore the layout components describe at least one element behavior of the pane element).

Regarding Dependent claim 35, the claim describes a web page document containing the same limitation as claim 13, and is similarly rejected under the same rationale.

Regarding Dependent claim 36, Klevenz discloses *wherein the content is one of a text, an image, a link, and a user interface* (paragraph 59, wherein the various data includes a user interface).

Regarding Dependent claim 37, Klevenz discloses *wherein the pane-generating instructions determine the pane attributes based on attributes of the content* (paragraph 56, wherein the logic determines a result based on the information for pane generation).

Regarding Dependent claim 38, the claim describes a web page document

containing the same limitation as claim 20, and is similarly rejected under the same rationale.

Regarding Independent claim 47, Klevenz discloses *a pane element for a markup language document, comprising:*

- *A starting tag including a reference to underlying pane-generating logic bound to the pane element for generating a web page pane, wherein a web browser can find the pane-generating logic using the reference* (See figure 4A & paragraph 91, wherein a starting tag is shown that includes a reference or references to pane-generating logic and it is bound within the pane element. In addition the pane references are inherently referenced by the web browser for generating the respective pane with layout information pertaining to its attributes);
- *And optionally, a list of attribute variables, wherein an attribute value can be specified and implemented by the underlying pane-generating logic* (paragraph 58, wherein a service directory is used to store information pertaining to attributes which includes a list of attribute values based on a users role).

Regarding Dependent claim 48, Klevenz discloses *wherein content for display in the web page pane is includable between the starting tag and the ending tag* (paragraph 80, wherein the specification file represented by the markup language

includes content information described by identifiers for layout components within the pane).

Regarding Independent claim 58, Klevenz discloses *one or more computer readable media containing instructions that are executable by a computer to perform actions, comprising:*

- *Executing language elements in a markup language document to generate a web page* (See figure 4A, paragraphs 44, 47 & 80, wherein markup language elements are executed to generate interfaces or panes for web pages);
- *And executing a pane element in the markup language document to generate a web page pane, wherein a web page pane is a division of a computer display screen, and wherein execution of the pane element causes pane-generating instructions written in the markup language to be substituted for the pane element* (See figure 4A, paragraph 80, wherein a pane element described by the markup language document is used to generate a pane. The execution of the pane definition or element causes pane-generating instructions that are part of the pane element and are therefore inherently substituted within the element).

Regarding Independent claim 61, Klevenz discloses *a method, comprising:*

- *Providing a markup language tag for creating a pane in a web page* (See figure 4A, paragraphs 44, 47 & 80, wherein markup language is provided for creating a pane within a web page);
- *Based at least in part on execution of the tag, invoking logic associated with the tag wherein the logic specifies at least some attributes of a pane* (See figure 4A, paragraphs 44, 47 & 80, wherein the execution of the pane tag invokes the logic associated to the layout or attribute information);
- *And generating the pane having the specified attributes* (paragraph 80, wherein the pane or panes are generated with the associated layout components that pertain to specified attributes within the pane).

Regarding Dependent claim 63, Klevenz discloses *wherein the markup language is a hypertext markup language* (See paragraphs 47, 49, 79 & 80, wherein the configuration file shown in this case is described in XML, but it could be in any appropriate programming language including HTML).

Regarding Dependent claim 64, Klevenz discloses *wherein the providing provides a document that includes the tag* (paragraph 80, wherein the specification page provides a document in a markup language including a tag).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

13. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

14. Claims 21-26, 28-31, 39-42, 44-46 & 49-57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Klevenz (U.S. Pub 2003/0137540, filed Dec 26, 2002) in view of Cecco (U.S. 6,310,631, filed Apr 25, 1997).

Regarding Dependent claims 21 & 39, Klevenz teaches the generation of panes based on user interaction (paragraph 6). Klevenz fails to teach a pane modification in relation to another pane. Cecco teaches *wherein the associated logic adjusts a first pane depending on a characteristic of a second pane* (column 3, lines 25-42, wherein a new pane is created which is equal in size to the resultant rectangular form and also the existing panes are resized so that the display screen now includes the new pane along with all of the existing panes. Therefore the new pane is adjusted by size, which represents a characteristic based on the previous panes that also changes to accommodate the new pane). Klevenz and Cecco are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of user interface and pane generation. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include a characteristic relation between panes. The motivation for doing so would have been to accommodate the generation of new panes by allowing the resizing and

positioning of previous panes thereby preventing pane content from being blocked. Therefore it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Cecco with Klevenz for the benefits of allowing pane generation with associated character relationships between panes thereby preventing pane content from being blocked by allowing the resizing and positioning of panes.

Regarding Dependent claim 22, Klevenz fails to teach a self-adjusting pane in relation to the other panes. Cecco teaches *wherein a pane adjusts itself depending on a characteristic or behavior of one or more other panes* (column 3, lines 25-42, wherein a new pane is created which is equal in size to the resultant rectangular form and also the existing panes are resized so that the display screen now includes the new pane along with all of the existing panes. Therefore the existing panes are self-adjusting in relation to the characteristic relating to the size of the panes). Klevenz and Cecco are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of user interface and pane generation. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include a characteristic relation between panes. The motivation for doing so would have been to accommodate the generation of new panes by allowing the resizing and positioning of previous panes thereby preventing pane content from being blocked. Therefore it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Cecco with Klevenz for the benefits of allowing pane generation with associated

character relationships between panes thereby preventing pane content from being blocked by allowing the resizing and positioning of panes.

Regarding Dependent claim 23, Klevenz fails to teach a self-adjusting pane in relation to the other panes. Cecco teaches *wherein a first pane adjusts a second pane depending on a characteristic or behavior of the first pane* (column 3, lines 25-42, wherein a new pane is created which is equal in size to the resultant rectangular form and also the existing panes are resized so that the display screen now includes the new pane along with all of the existing panes. Therefore the existing panes are self-adjusting in relation to the characteristic relating to the size of the panes). Klevenz and Cecco are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of user interface and pane generation. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include a characteristic relation between panes. The motivation for doing so would have been to accommodate the generation of new panes by allowing the resizing and positioning of previous panes thereby preventing pane content from being blocked. Therefore it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Cecco with Klevenz for the benefits of allowing pane generation with associated character relationships between panes thereby preventing pane content from being blocked by allowing the resizing and positioning of panes.

Regarding Dependent claims 24 & 40, Klevenz fails to teach a self-adjusting pane in relation to the other panes. Cecco teaches *wherein an attribute of the first pane is adjusted based on changing content in the second pane* (column 3, lines 25-42, wherein a new pane is created which is equal in size to the resultant rectangular form and also the existing panes are resized so that the display screen now includes the new pane along with all of the existing panes. If the content in an existing pane is increased then it inherently changes the size to display the content, therefore the new pane attribute or its size is adjusted based on the changing content in the existing pane). Klevenz and Cecco are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of user interface and pane generation. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include a characteristic relation between panes. The motivation for doing so would have been to accommodate the generation of new panes by allowing the resizing and positioning of previous panes thereby preventing pane content from being blocked. Therefore it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Cecco with Klevenz for the benefits of allowing pane generation with associated character relationships between panes thereby preventing pane content from being blocked by allowing the resizing and positioning of panes.

Regarding Dependent claims 25 & 41, Klevenz teaches *wherein an attribute of content in the first pane is changed based on a change in an attribute of content*

in the second pane (See figure 3 & paragraphs 69, 71 & 74, wherein reference numeral 322 shows content relating to search in one pane and the results in another pane, therefore it inherently shows that changes made within a panes content effects the content of another pane, in this case the attribute refers to the different sizes of the pane based on the changing content).

Regarding Dependent claims 26 & 42, Klevenz teaches *wherein content in the second pane is changed as the content is edited in the first pane* (See figure 3 & paragraphs 69, 71 & 74, wherein reference numeral 322 shows content relating to search in one pane and the results in another pane, therefore it inherently shows that changes made within a panes content effects the content of another pane, in this case the attribute refers to the different sizes of the pane based on the changing content).

Regarding Dependent claims 28 & 44, Klevenz fails to shows the sizing and positioning of panes. Cecco teaches *wherein the placement includes a pane size and a position in the web page.* (column 3, lines 1-13, wherein the position and sizes of panes are changed). Klevenz and Cecco are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of user interface and pane generation. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include elements describing the sizing and positioning of a pane. The motivation for doing so would have been to accommodate the generation of

new panes by allowing the resizing and positioning of previous panes thereby preventing pane content from being blocked. Therefore it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Cecco with Klevenz for the benefits of allowing pane generation without blocking previous pane content by allowing the resizing and positioning of panes.

Regarding Dependent claims 29 & 45, Klevenz fails to teach a self-adjusting pane in relation to the other panes. Cecco teaches *wherein the placement of one pane depends at least in part on the placement of remaining panes of the multiple panes* (See figure 4A, column 2, lines 55-60, wherein the invention allows users to divide a single pane, existing pane into two panes that take up the same space as the previous pane but also permit new panes to accommodate space from multiple, existing panes). Klevenz and Cecco are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of user interface and pane generation. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include elements describing the sizing and positioning of a pane. The motivation for doing so would have been to accommodate the generation of new panes by allowing the resizing and positioning of previous panes thereby preventing pane content from being blocked. Therefore it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Cecco with Klevenz for the benefits of allowing pane generation without blocking previous pane content by allowing the resizing and positioning of panes.

Regarding Dependent claims 30 & 46, Klevenz fails to teach the use of z-order display priority for adjusting the pane locations. Cecco teaches *wherein the placement includes a z-order of display priority in response to an overlapping of two or more of the multiple panes, wherein a pane having the highest z-order of display priority is focused by having the remaining panes subordinated to the focused pane by appearing to be displayed behind the focused pane* (See figures 7, 8A & 8B, wherein the plane placement is determined taking the Z-order priority for overlapping panes). Klevenz and Cecco are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of user interface and pane generation. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the use of Z-order priority for determining overlapping priority of panes. The motivation for doing so would have been to accommodate the generation of new panes by allowing the resizing and positioning of previous panes thereby preventing pane content from being blocked. Therefore it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Cecco with Klevenz for the benefits of allowing pane generation without blocking previous pane content by using Z-order priority.

Regarding Dependent claim 31, Klevenz fails to teach the use of z-order display priority for adjusting the pane locations. Cecco teaches *wherein if one or more of the multiple panes include an interactive user interface, then changing the z-order of display priority to give a highest priority to a pane with an*

interactive user interface in current use (See figures 7, 8A & 8B, wherein the plane placement is determined taking the Z-order priority for overlapping panes including the active interface). Klevenz and Cecco are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of user interface and pane generation. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the use of Z-order priority for determining overlapping priority of panes. The motivation for doing so would have been to accommodate the generation of new panes by allowing the resizing and positioning of previous panes thereby preventing pane content from being blocked. Therefore it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Cecco with Klevenz for the benefits of allowing pane generation without blocking previous pane content by using Z-order priority.

Regarding Independent claim 49, Klevenz teaches a pane engine, comprising:
A pane attribute assignor (paragraph 80, wherein the pane attributes are described by identifiers that describe the layout information of a pane. The layout information represents the attribute assignors to the panes); although it is well known in the art Klevenz fails to show the sizing and positioning of panes.
Cecco teaches a pane sizer; and a pane positioner, wherein a pane element included in a web page document references the pane engine to generate a web page pane (column 3, lines 1-13, wherein the position and sizes of panes are changed, therefore showing a pane sizer and pane positioner for modifying

panes). Klevenz and Cecco are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of user interface and pane generation. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include elements describing the sizing and positioning of a pane. The motivation for doing so would have been to accommodate the generation of new panes by allowing the resizing and positioning of previous panes thereby preventing pane content from being blocked. Therefore it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Cecco with Klevenz for the benefits of allowing pane generation without blocking previous pane content by allowing the resizing and positioning of panes.

Regarding Dependent claim 50, Klevenz teaches *default pane attributes for generating the web page pane* (paragraph 80, wherein panes are inherently associated to default layout describing attributes, setting the layout of the pane to default or by user interaction is a matter of design choice).

Regarding Dependent claim 51, Klevenz teaches *an attribute reader to obtain one of pane attributes and content attributes selected by a user* (paragraph 80, wherein the attribute reader is represented by the identifier used to describe the pane attributes and the layout components within the pane pertaining to the content attributes).

Regarding Dependent claim 52, Klevenz teaches *multipane coordinator to generate the web page pane based at least in part on attributes of one or more other web page panes* (paragraph 80, wherein a controller is the multipane coordinator for generating web page panes based on layout information of multiple panes).

Regarding Dependent claim 53, Klevenz fails to teach the use of Z-order priority for the display of panes. Cecco teaches *wherein the multipane coordinator includes a Z-order prioritizer to determine an order of web page panes in a cascaded stack of web page panes appearing on a display screen* (See figures 7, 8A & 8B, wherein the plane placement is determined taking the Z-order priority for overlapping panes including the active interface). Klevenz and Cecco are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of user interface and pane generation. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the use of Z-order priority for determining overlapping priority of panes. The motivation for doing so would have been to accommodate the generation of new panes by allowing the resizing and positioning of previous panes thereby preventing pane content from being blocked. Therefore it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Cecco with Klevenz for the benefits of allowing pane generation without blocking previous pane content by using Z-order priority.

Regarding Dependent claim 54, Klevenz fails to teach the determination of an active pane within multiple panes. Cecco teaches *a focus assignor to determine which pane of multiple panes is active or on top of a cascaded stack of web page panes appearing on a display screen* (See figures 7, 8A & 8B, wherein the plane placement is determined taking the Z-order priority for overlapping panes including determining the active interface). Klevenz and Cecco are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of user interface and pane generation. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the use of Z-order priority for determining overlapping priority of panes. The motivation for doing so would have been to accommodate the generation of new panes by allowing the resizing and positioning of previous panes thereby preventing pane content from being blocked. Therefore it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Cecco with Klevenz for the benefits of allowing pane generation without blocking previous pane content by using Z-order priority.

Regarding Dependent claim 55, Klevenz teaches *an attribute interrelation module including a pane attribute analyzer and a content attribute analyzer, wherein a pane attribute of a first pane is determined based on a pane attribute or a content attribute of a second pane* (See figure 3 & paragraph 80, wherein the controller acts has a pane attribute and content analyzer, thereby the pane

attribute or content is associated to another panes content).

Regarding Dependent claim 56, Klevenz teaches a *dynamic content linker* to enable changes in a content of a first pane to affect display of a content in a second pane (See figure 3 & paragraphs 69, 71 & 74, wherein the panes are associated by a dynamic content linker connected by flow lines allowing pane replacement via controller).

Regarding Dependent claim 57, Klevenz teaches a *common resource linker*, wherein changes in content in the common resource are simultaneously displayed in two or more panes (See figure 3 & paragraphs 69, 71 & 74, wherein the panes are associated by a common content linker connected by flow lines allowing pane replacement via controller in several panes).

Other Prior Art Cited

15. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Distefano III et al (U.S. 6771291) discloses "Method For Developing Electronic Documents Employing Multiple Display Regions"
- Santoro et al. (U.S. Pub 2003/0020671) discloses "System And Method For Simultaneous Display Of multiple Information Sources"

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Manglesh M. Patel whose telephone number is (571) 272-5937. The examiner can normally be reached on M,F 8:30-6:00 T,TH 8:30-3:00 Wed 8:30-7:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen S. Hong can be reached on (571)272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Manglesh M. Patel

Patent Examiner

November 8, 2005



CESARIO PAULA
PRIMARY EXAMINER